

Applicant : John P. Holden et al.
Serial No. : 09/696,989
Filed : October 26, 2000
Page : 5

Attorney's Docket No.: 00216-519001 / Case 8075

REMARKS

The invention, as claimed in independent claim 1, is directed to making a shaving razor handle by molding a solid inner core of a first plastic in opposed first mold cavities, molding an outer portion of a second plastic around the inner core in opposed second mold cavities, and molding at least one elastomeric grip portion on the outer portion at opposed third mold cavities. Independent claim 15 recites that the first and second plastics are made of the same composition and have the same appearance. Claims 1 and 15 have been amended to make it explicit that the inner core is a solid inner core.

In the invention, as described in independent claims 1 and 15, a thick plastic portion of a shaving razor handle can be efficiently molded in two steps by reducing the amount and thickness of plastic that is injected and cured at one time. By injecting the plastic in two steps, the formation of the part is much quicker than it would be if the entire amount of plastic were injected in a single step. Quick curing can desirably provide for maintenance of a textured surface finish that might otherwise melt to a smooth surface with dissipation of heat from a thick molded part. Dependent claim 16 recites injecting the same clear plastic in the first and second shots, and new dependent claim 17 recites a textured surface on the outer portion of the second shot.

Claims 1 and 15 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) on the basis of Wright in view of Marcus, Boucherie, Moskovich, Meessmann, Burout, Gray, Miller and Yamada (JP).

Marcus has been added as a new reference.

Wright is cited for disclosure of molding a tooth brush handle in multiple molding steps including first molding a first plastic to provide both an interior spine and external surface stripes of a first material or color and thereafter molding a second plastic that fills in the gaps in the surface left by the first plastic. Wright is also cited for disclosure of two or more shots.

Marcus is cited for disclosure of molding an article in a series of layers to speed up production of the article.

Miller, Gray and Burout are cited for disclosure of shaving razor handles with gripping portions. Meesmann, Moskovich and Boucherie are cited for disclosure of tooth brush handles

Applicant : John P. Holden et al.
Serial No. : 09/696,989
Filed : October 26, 2000
Page : 6

Attorney's Docket No.: 00216-519001 / Case 8075

with rigid plastic and softer material grips. Yamada is cited for disclosure of a multicolored handle made by a multiple shot method.

Wright's fundamental teaching is making an article with a multicolored surface pattern, and Wright emphasizes using different colors for the first and second shots. (See title and discussion at col. 1, lines 48-56, col. 2, lines 3-11, 17-42; and col. 3, lines 29-40). Wright thus stresses that the first plastic shot of the inner spine be the same plastic shot that provides stripes (or other patterns) at the external surface. This teaching is inconsistent with having an inner core that does not have any external surface portions, as required by claim 1. New independent claim 15 recites that the first and second plastics are made of the same composition and have the same appearance. This is the antithesis of the use of different colors to provide a pattern, as recited in Wright.

Marcus is said to teach building up layers in creating a molded article. Marcus, however, is directed to a fundamentally different type of procedure, namely parisons used in making bottles or other hollow objects (col. 1, lines 37), e.g., by blow molding (col. 2, lines 37-44), and addresses the particular problem of maintaining shape of such hollow, thin-walled parisons after retrieval of the core (col. 1, lines 8-12). Marcus is not directed to creating articles with solid inner cores as required by the claims, but is instead directed to problems with molding hollow thin-walled articles, and it would not have been obvious to apply his teachings to making a handle with a solid inner core.

The remaining references cited in the rejection do make up the deficiencies of Wright and Marcus.

The references, taken alone or in combination, accordingly do not disclose or suggest the subject matter of claims 1 and 15, and claims 1 and 15 are allowable under 35 USC 103(a). The remaining claims depend on claim 1 or 15 and are allowable with them.